

The Hong Kong Daily Press.

NO. 6917

日大月二年印結光

HONGKONG, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 6TH, 1880.

香港體

六月二英

港元

PRICE \$24 PER MONTH.

SHIPPING.

ANNUALIS.
February 5, HALLOUIN, Brit. str., 277, Goode,
Swatow, 4th January, General—D. L.
PAIR & Co.
February 5, BESONSHIRE, British str., 1,240,
Swatow, 14th January, Coal
ADAMSON, BELL & Co.
February 5, GLENLYON, British str., 1,374,
John Wallace, London, 21st December,
and Singapore, 31st January, General—
JARDINE, MATHERSON & Co.
February 5, WING SHIN SHING, Chinese sch.,
400, D. Scott, Sawmills 26th December,
and Singapore, Timber—ROBERT AFOOK
& Co.
February 5, FAIRY BEAUTY, German bark,
278, K. Kote, Labuan 10th January,
Elatius and Wood—CARLOWITZ & Co.
CLERKAGERS.
AT THE HAMBURG MASTERS OFFICE,
FEBRUARY 5TH.
Kempen Cards, British steamer, for Manila.
Dough, British steamer, for East Coast.
Moore's Tower, American schooner, for New
York.
Bonita, German bark, for Whampoa.
Terrier, German brig, for Quinhon.

DEPARTURES.

February 5, YANTZE, French steamer, for
Swatow.

February 5, HAZEL HOLME, British bark, for
Tawau.

PASSENGERS.

ARRIVED.
Pen Hafong, str., from Swatow—28 Chinese.
Pen Glynion, str., from London, £2—273
Chinese.

DEPARTED.

Pen Glynion, str., for Shanghai—Mr. Ku Kio
Cheung from Macao.
Pen Tzu, str., for Yokohama—Messrs. S.
Mina, Sangoroku, Wakamatsu, and Satoro
from Macao.
Pen Glynion, str., Mr. G. H. French
from Madras—Major Macmillan.

TO DEPART.

Pen Glynion, str., for Manila—Mr. A.
Carter.
Pen Douglas, str., for East Coast—340 Chi-
nese.
Pen Terrier, for Quinhon—33 Chinese.

NOTICES.

The British steamship *Dreadnought* reports left
Naples on 21st December, and Singapore on 31st
January, and had moderate and fresh mon-
soons to last 18th Jan., and light winds with foggy
weather to port.

The British steamship *Glenlyon* reports left
Swatow on 4th January. Experienced a moder-
ate N.E. gale with dull, cloudy weather
and drizzling rain to port. In Swatow the
steamship *Venice* and Chinese cruiser *Pei-ko*
passed a steamer of Capo di Ponte, and passed
a French mail steamer off the Fine Pins.

NAGASAKI SHIPPING.

January 20.—ADVISORIES.
17. Kaungwa Maru, Jap. br., from Yokohama.
17. Sumatra Maru, Jap. br., from Yunnan.
17. Ching-tu, British cor., from Yunnan.
21. Amethyst, American bark, from Shanghai.
22. Vladivostok, Russian sch., from Shanghai.
23. Sankai Maru, Jap. br., from Shanghai.
23. Sankai Maru, Jap. br., from Yunnan.
23. Sankai Maru, Jap. br., for Yokohama.
23. Sankai Maru, Jap. br., for Yunnan.

YOKOHAMA SHIPPING.

January 20.—ADVISORIES.
18. City of Tokio, str., from S. Francisco.
18. Volga, French steamer, from Hongkong.
19. Titan, American ship, from Cardiff.
22. Nagoya Maru, Jap. str., from Shanghai.
23. China, British cor., from Hongkong.
23. Nagoya Maru, Jap. br., from Hongkong.
24. Guilei, Japanese steamer, from Hongkong.
January 21.—ADVISORIES.
23. City of Tokio, str., for Hongkong.
23. Nippon Maru, American bark, for New York.
24. Tokio Maru, Japanese bark, for Shanghai.
24. Sarai Scott, British bark, for Kobe.

VEHICLES ARRIVED IN EUROPE FROM PORTS
IN CHINA, JAPAN, AND MANILA.

(For last half of Advices.)
18. Indus (a)..... Manilla..... Nov. 5
Cassandra (a)..... Shanghai..... Nov. 9
Nishini Novgorod (a)..... Hongkong..... Nov. 13
Norden (a)..... Ponholw..... Nov. 16
Now Brunswick..... Kolo..... Nov. 16
Patio (a)..... China Ports..... Nov. 16
Ullah (a)..... China Ports..... Nov. 18
Lax (a)..... China Ports..... Nov. 18
Oceans (a)..... Hongkong..... Dec. 2
Viscount (a)..... Hongkong..... Dec. 2
Arabella (a)..... Manila..... Dec. 3
Sophie D. (a)..... Manila..... Dec. 3
Celsie Monarch (a)..... Amoy..... Dec. 4
Sunbeam (a)..... China Ports..... Dec. 4
Glenlyon (a)..... China Ports..... Dec. 6
Athena (a)..... China Ports..... Dec. 8
Dunhill (a)..... China Ports..... Dec. 10
Conqueror (a)..... Manila..... Dec. 12
Lord of the Isles (a)..... Manila..... Dec. 16
Falcon (a)..... Amoy..... Dec. 17
Orrestes (a)..... China Ports..... Dec. 20
Elizabeth (a)..... Manila..... Dec. 21
Calais (a)..... Manila..... Dec. 22
Gauville (a)..... Hongkong..... Dec. 24

YOKOHAMA.

(Corrected to Date.)
Elizabeth Rickmers..... Penang..... Oct. 9
Goldstein (a)..... Antwerp..... Aug. 17
Camilla and Idia (a)..... Cuxhaven..... Sept. 13
Lucia (a)..... London..... Sept. 25
G. Brightmore (a)..... Finsbury..... Sept. 28
Pym (a)..... Antwerp..... Oct. 1
John Gled (a)..... London..... Oct. 25
James S. Stone (a)..... New York..... Oct. 25
Maria Lotis (a)..... Antwerp..... Oct. 30
Core (a)..... London..... Nov. 1
Ellis (a)..... Penang..... Nov. 16
Forbes (a)..... Cuxhaven..... Nov. 30
Cleveland (a)..... Newcastle..... Dec. 18
Dover (a)..... Liverpool..... Dec. 18
Winnipeg (a)..... London..... Dec. 18
G. E. Morris (a)..... New York..... Dec. 20
Ava (a)..... Marsilles..... Jan. 11

AUCTION SALES TO-DAY.

Now.

HONGKONG, CANTON, AND MACAO
STEAMBOAT COMPANY,
LIMITED.

NOTICE TO SHAREHOLDERS.

The DIVIDEND at the rate of 4%, or \$3 per
share, declared at the Ordinary Share-
holders' meeting of shareholders held this Day,
will be payable at the HONGKONG AND SHANG-
HAI BANK on and after MONDAY, the 2nd
February next.

Shareholders are requested to apply at the
Office of the Company for Warrants.
By Order of the Board of Directors.

2. A. DA COSTA,

Secretary.
Hongkong, 30th January, 1880. [234]

BANKS.

NATIONAL BANK OF INDIA,
LIMITED.

Registered in London under the Companies' Act
of 1862, on 2nd March, 1866.

Established in Calcutta 29th September, 1863.

SUBSCRIBED CAPITAL..... \$300,000.

PAID-UP CAPITAL..... \$255,220.

RESERVE FUND..... \$20,000.

HEAD OFFICE—
39A, THREADNEARE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

LONDON BANKERS—
NATIONAL PROVINCIAL BANK OF ENGLAND,
NATIONAL BANK OF SCOTLAND.

All descriptions of Banking and Exchange
business transacted.

Interest allowed on CURRENT ACCOUNTS at
the rate of 2 per cent. per annum, and on
the PAYMENT OF DEPOSITS according
to arrangement—the maximum rate being 5 per
cent per annum.

R. V. SANDEMAN,
Manager.

Hongkong, 1st November, 1879. [1748]

COMPTOIR DES COMPTES DE PARIS,
Incorporated 7th and 18th March, 1848.

Recognised by the International Convention of
30th April, 1862.

CAPITAL PAID-UP..... £3,300,000.

RESERVE FUND..... £300,000.

HEAD OFFICE—14, RUE BERGER, PARIS.

AGENCIES AND BRANCHES AT:
LONDON, BOMBAY, SAN FRANCISCO,
MARSULLES, BOMBAY, HONGKONG,
LYONS, CALCUTTA, HANNOVER,
NANTES, SHANGHAI, FOOCHOW.

THE HONGKONG AGENCEY receives Fixed Deposits
on Terms to be established on application, grants
Drafts and Credits on all parts of the world,
and transacts every description of Banking Ex-
change Business.

E. G. VOUILLEMONT,
Manager.

Hongkong, 29th December, 1879. [10]

TO BE LET.

TO LET.

</

NO W R E A D Y .

THE CHRONICLE AND DIRECTORY
FOR CHINA; JAPAN, &c.

For 1880.

(With which is incorporated "THE CHINA
DIRECTORY").This Work, the ONLY one of the kind in China
or Japan, is not in theEIGHTEENTH YEAR
in its existence, and is NOW READY FOR SALE.It has been compiled from the MOST AUTHEN-
TIC SOURCES, and no pains have been spared to
render it THOROUGHLY RELIABLE, both as a
Dictionary and as a Work of Reference on Com-
mercial Matters."The Chronicle and Directory for China,
Japan, and the Philippines" is published in
Two Forms—Complete at \$3; or with the Lists
of Presidents, Port Descriptions and Directories,
Plan of Victoria, and Code of Signals, at \$3.Orders for Copies may be sent to the "Daily
Press" Office, where it is published, or to the
following Agents:MACAO Messrs. A. A. da Malla & Co.
SWATOW Messrs. Campbell & Co.AMOY Messrs. Wilson, Nisbolls & Co.
FOONHWA Messrs. Wilson, Nichols & Co.
HOLGEO Messrs. Holg & Co.

NINGPO Messrs. Kelly & Walsh, Shanghai

SHANGHAI Messrs. Hall & Holtz

NANKING Messrs. Hall & Holtz

LIVERPOOL PORTS Messrs. Hall & Holtz, Shanghai

NAGASAKI The C. & J. Trading Co.

HOKKAIDO Japanese Gazette Office.

MARINA Messrs. Vinda de Loyza & Co.

SAIGON Mr. J. H. Bloom

SINGAPORE Messrs. Sayle & Co.

BANGKOK Messrs. Julian & Co.

LONDON Mr. B. Alcock, Olaveau & Co.

LONDON Messrs. Goo, Street & Co.

LONDON Messrs. Butes, Hendy & Co.

SANFRANCISCO Mr. L. P. Fisher, 31, Merchant's
Exchange.NEW YORK Messrs. S. M. Pettingill & Co.,
37, Park Row.

Daily Press Office, 13th January, 1880.

NOTICE.

A. S. WATSON & CO.,
FAMILY AND DISPENSING
CHEMISTS.By Appointment to His Excellency the Go-
VERNOR and his Royal Highness the

DUKE OF EDINBURGH,

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DRUGGISTS.

PATENT MEDICINE VENDORS.

DRUGGISTS' SUPPLYERS.

And

ABRATED WATER MAKERS.

SHIP'S MEDICINE CHESTS REFITTED,

PASSENGER SEATS SUPPLIED.

NOTICES.—To avoid delay in the execution of
Orders it is particularly requested that all
business communications be addressed to the
Firm, A. S. Watson and Co., or

HONGKONG DISPENSARY. [31]

The report made by Dr. Eitel on the so-called domestic slavery or servitude question is an elaborate and able essay, displaying great knowledge of the subject and doing much credit to the argumentative capacity of the writer. The conclusions arrived at, however, are not so logical as might have been expected from a clear-headed reasoner, and the whole author somewhat too strongly of special pleading. The propositions with which the learned Doctor sum up seem to us to amount simply to this—that Chinese domestic servitude being an essentially Chinese custom among a Chinese community cannot be brought under English law; ergo, English law must give way in an English Colony to Chinese custom. An Englishman would not agree thus. We do not seek to impose our laws upon China; but all persons who come here are expected, without distinction of race, to conform to English law. Because a large proportion of the population of this Colony happens to be Chinese it does not follow that they are to be allowed to perpetuate practices here which, however sanctioned by the custom of their own country, are opposed to the fundamental principles of the British constitution. Dr. Eitel says that Chinese domestic servitude cannot logically be brought under the provisions of any English enactment regarding the negro form of slavery. Perhaps not, but the sale of human flesh in any form and under any pretext is repugnant to the spirit and practice of English law, and can logically be put down under its provisions. Dr. Eitel tells us that to prohibit Chinese domestic servitude, in so far, would "constitute an act of violence, as striking at the very roots of the social organism, the results of which would, in all probability, be harmful to the Chinese and embarrassing to the Government." Few evils would be rectified if Governments shirked their duty to avoid trouble and embarrassment. Temporary distress and annoyance have often to be endured to ensure ultimate benefit, and it is absurd to suppose that any social reform can be effected without some disturbance of vested interests and existing institutions.

Few, we imagine, even of the most ardent supporters of slavery in its mildest and most harmless form—which we consider Chinese domestic servitude to be—would dream of advocating instant and violent changes in the existing order of things. As we have said, on previous occasions, when referring to this subject, the Government of this Colony has, either through ignorance of facts or from apathy with regard to them, allowed the Chinese residents to import their peculiar institutions here, and has winked at the custom of selling children to be adopted or to become maid-servants for such a long period of years that any sudden and arbitrary action now would be both very unjust and inconsistent. No great hardship need be inflicted that we can see; no present holders of slave girls should be prosecuted; only the sale of children should be forbidden for the future because of the abuses arising out of it, and because it is utterly irreconcileable with English law. However kindly treated the bondsmen may be, the fact remains that their masters or mistresses acquire a right of ownership by purchase, and this cannot be recognised in an English Colony. It is not by altering our law to suit oriental customs that we may expect

to elate, and improve the Chinese race. While we may safely concede certain points respecting some of their traditions and customs, where no principle is violated, it is unreasonable to suppose that such a concession can be made as would be involved in harmonising English laws with Chinese customs.

A telegram has been received from Singapore by the military authorities here stating that the trooper Tunc, Captain Stokes, left that port on Tuesday, the 3rd instant.

It has been compiled from the MOST AUTHEN-
TIC SOURCES, and no pains have been spared to render it THOROUGHLY RELIABLE, both as a
Dictionary and as a Work of Reference on Com-
mercial Matters."The Chronicle and Directory for China,
Japan, and the Philippines" is published in
Two Forms—Complete at \$3; or with the Lists
of Presidents, Port Descriptions and Directories,
Plan of Victoria, and Code of Signals, at \$3.Orders for Copies may be sent to the "Daily
Press" Office, where it is published, or to the
following Agents:

MACAO Messrs. A. A. da Malla & Co.

SWATOW Messrs. Campbell & Co.

AMOY Messrs. Wilson, Nisbolls & Co.

FOONHWA Messrs. Wilson, Nichols & Co.

HOLGEO Messrs. Holg & Co.

NINGPO Messrs. Kelly & Walsh, Shanghai

SHANGHAI Messrs. Hall & Holtz

NANKING Messrs. Hall & Holtz

LIVERPOOL PORTS Messrs. Hall & Holtz

LONDON Messrs. Goo, Street & Co.

LONDON Messrs. Butes, Hendy & Co.

LONDON San Francisco, 31, Merchant's
Exchange.NEW YORK Messrs. S. M. Pettingill & Co.,
37, Park Row.

Daily Press Office, 13th January, 1880.

NOTICE.

A. S. WATSON & CO.,
FAMILY AND DISPENSING
CHEMISTS.By Appointment to His Excellency the Go-
VERNOR and his Royal Highness the

DUKE OF EDINBURGH,

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DRUGGISTS.

PATENT MEDICINE VENDORS.

DRUGGISTS' SUPPLYERS.

And

ABRATED WATER MAKERS.

SHIP'S MEDICINE CHESTS REFITTED,

PASSENGER SEATS SUPPLIED.

NOTICES.—To avoid delay in the execution of
Orders it is particularly requested that all
business communications be addressed to the
Firm, A. S. Watson and Co., or

HONGKONG DISPENSARY. [31]

The Daily Press.

HONGKONG, FEBRUARY 6TH, 1880.

The report made by Dr. Eitel on the so-called domestic slavery or servitude question is an elaborate and able essay, displaying great knowledge of the subject and doing much credit to the argumentative capacity of the writer. The conclusions arrived at, however, are not so logical as might have been expected from a clear-headed reasoner, and the whole author somewhat too strongly of special pleading. The propositions with which the learned Doctor sum up seem to us to amount simply to this—that Chinese domestic servitude being an essentially Chinese custom among a Chinese community cannot be brought under English law; ergo, English law must give way in an English Colony to Chinese custom. An Englishman would not agree thus. We do not seek to impose our laws upon China; but all persons who come here are expected, without distinction of race, to conform to English law. Because a large proportion of the population of this Colony happens to be Chinese it does not follow that they are to be allowed to perpetuate practices here which, however sanctioned by the custom of their own country, are opposed to the fundamental principles of the British constitution. Dr. Eitel says that Chinese domestic servitude cannot logically be brought under the provisions of any English enactment regarding the negro form of slavery. Perhaps not, but the sale of human flesh in any form and under any pretext is repugnant to the spirit and practice of English law, and can logically be put down under its provisions. Dr. Eitel tells us that to prohibit Chinese domestic servitude, in so far, would "constitute an act of violence, as striking at the very roots of the social organism, the results of which would, in all probability, be harmful to the Chinese and embarrassing to the Government." Few evils would be rectified if Governments shirked their duty to avoid trouble and embarrassment. Temporary distress and annoyance have often to be endured to ensure ultimate benefit, and it is absurd to suppose that any social reform can be effected without some disturbance of vested interests and existing institutions.

The report made by Dr. Eitel on the so-called domestic slavery or servitude question is an elaborate and able essay, displaying great knowledge of the subject and doing much credit to the argumentative capacity of the writer. The conclusions arrived at, however, are not so logical as might have been expected from a clear-headed reasoner, and the whole author somewhat too strongly of special pleading. The propositions with which the learned Doctor sum up seem to us to amount simply to this—that Chinese domestic servitude being an essentially Chinese custom among a Chinese community cannot be brought under English law; ergo, English law must give way in an English Colony to Chinese custom. An Englishman would not agree thus. We do not seek to impose our laws upon China; but all persons who come here are expected, without distinction of race, to conform to English law. Because a large proportion of the population of this Colony happens to be Chinese it does not follow that they are to be allowed to perpetuate practices here which, however sanctioned by the custom of their own country, are opposed to the fundamental principles of the British constitution. Dr. Eitel says that Chinese domestic servitude cannot logically be brought under the provisions of any English enactment regarding the negro form of slavery. Perhaps not, but the sale of human flesh in any form and under any pretext is repugnant to the spirit and practice of English law, and can logically be put down under its provisions. Dr. Eitel tells us that to prohibit Chinese domestic servitude, in so far, would "constitute an act of violence, as striking at the very roots of the social organism, the results of which would, in all probability, be harmful to the Chinese and embarrassing to the Government." Few evils would be rectified if Governments shirked their duty to avoid trouble and embarrassment. Temporary distress and annoyance have often to be endured to ensure ultimate benefit, and it is absurd to suppose that any social reform can be effected without some disturbance of vested interests and existing institutions.

The report made by Dr. Eitel on the so-called domestic slavery or servitude question is an elaborate and able essay, displaying great knowledge of the subject and doing much credit to the argumentative capacity of the writer. The conclusions arrived at, however, are not so logical as might have been expected from a clear-headed reasoner, and the whole author somewhat too strongly of special pleading. The propositions with which the learned Doctor sum up seem to us to amount simply to this—that Chinese domestic servitude being an essentially Chinese custom among a Chinese community cannot be brought under English law; ergo, English law must give way in an English Colony to Chinese custom. An Englishman would not agree thus. We do not seek to impose our laws upon China; but all persons who come here are expected, without distinction of race, to conform to English law. Because a large proportion of the population of this Colony happens to be Chinese it does not follow that they are to be allowed to perpetuate practices here which, however sanctioned by the custom of their own country, are opposed to the fundamental principles of the British constitution. Dr. Eitel says that Chinese domestic servitude cannot logically be brought under the provisions of any English enactment regarding the negro form of slavery. Perhaps not, but the sale of human flesh in any form and under any pretext is repugnant to the spirit and practice of English law, and can logically be put down under its provisions. Dr. Eitel tells us that to prohibit Chinese domestic servitude, in so far, would "constitute an act of violence, as striking at the very roots of the social organism, the results of which would, in all probability, be harmful to the Chinese and embarrassing to the Government." Few evils would be rectified if Governments shirked their duty to avoid trouble and embarrassment. Temporary distress and annoyance have often to be endured to ensure ultimate benefit, and it is absurd to suppose that any social reform can be effected without some disturbance of vested interests and existing institutions.

The report made by Dr. Eitel on the so-called domestic slavery or servitude question is an elaborate and able essay, displaying great knowledge of the subject and doing much credit to the argumentative capacity of the writer. The conclusions arrived at, however, are not so logical as might have been expected from a clear-headed reasoner, and the whole author somewhat too strongly of special pleading. The propositions with which the learned Doctor sum up seem to us to amount simply to this—that Chinese domestic servitude being an essentially Chinese custom among a Chinese community cannot be brought under English law; ergo, English law must give way in an English Colony to Chinese custom. An Englishman would not agree thus. We do not seek to impose our laws upon China; but all persons who come here are expected, without distinction of race, to conform to English law. Because a large proportion of the population of this Colony happens to be Chinese it does not follow that they are to be allowed to perpetuate practices here which, however sanctioned by the custom of their own country, are opposed to the fundamental principles of the British constitution. Dr. Eitel says that Chinese domestic servitude cannot logically be brought under the provisions of any English enactment regarding the negro form of slavery. Perhaps not, but the sale of human flesh in any form and under any pretext is repugnant to the spirit and practice of English law, and can logically be put down under its provisions. Dr. Eitel tells us that to prohibit Chinese domestic servitude, in so far, would "constitute an act of violence, as striking at the very roots of the social organism, the results of which would, in all probability, be harmful to the Chinese and embarrassing to the Government." Few evils would be rectified if Governments shirked their duty to avoid trouble and embarrassment. Temporary distress and annoyance have often to be endured to ensure ultimate benefit, and it is absurd to suppose that any social reform can be effected without some disturbance of vested interests and existing institutions.

The report made by Dr. Eitel on the so-called domestic slavery or servitude question is an elaborate and able essay, displaying great knowledge of the subject and doing much credit to the argumentative capacity of the writer. The conclusions arrived at, however, are not so logical as might have been expected from a clear-headed reasoner, and the whole author somewhat too strongly of special pleading. The propositions with which the learned Doctor sum up seem to us to amount simply to this—that Chinese domestic servitude being an essentially Chinese custom among a Chinese community cannot be brought under English law; ergo, English law must give way in an English Colony to Chinese custom. An Englishman would not agree thus. We do not seek to impose our laws upon China; but all persons who come here are expected, without distinction of race, to conform to English law. Because a large proportion of the population of this Colony happens to be Chinese it does not follow that they are to be allowed to perpetuate practices here which, however sanctioned by the custom of their own country, are opposed to the fundamental principles of the British constitution. Dr. Eitel says that Chinese domestic servitude cannot logically be brought under the provisions of any English enactment regarding the negro form of slavery. Perhaps not, but the sale of human flesh in any form and under any pretext is repugnant to the spirit and practice of English law, and can logically be put down under its provisions. Dr. Eitel tells us that to prohibit Chinese domestic servitude, in so far, would "constitute an act of violence, as striking at the very roots of the social organism, the results of which would, in all probability, be harmful to the Chinese and embarrassing to the Government." Few evils would be rectified if Governments shirked their duty to avoid trouble and embarrassment. Temporary distress and annoyance have often to be endured to ensure ultimate benefit, and it is absurd to suppose that any social reform can be effected without some disturbance of vested interests and existing institutions.

The report made by Dr. Eitel on the so-called domestic slavery or servitude question is an elaborate and able essay, displaying great knowledge of the subject and doing much credit to the argumentative capacity of the writer. The conclusions arrived at, however, are not so logical as might have been expected from a clear-headed reasoner, and the whole author somewhat too strongly of special pleading. The propositions with which the learned Doctor sum up seem to us to amount simply to this—that Chinese domestic servitude being an essentially Chinese custom among a Chinese community cannot be brought under English law; ergo, English law must give way in an English Colony to Chinese custom. An Englishman would not agree thus. We do not seek to impose our laws upon China; but all persons who come here are expected, without distinction of race, to conform to English law. Because a large proportion of the population of this Colony happens to be Chinese it does not follow that they are to be allowed to perpetuate practices here which, however sanctioned by the custom of their own country, are opposed to the fundamental principles of the British constitution. Dr. Eitel says that Chinese domestic servitude cannot logically be brought under the provisions of any English enactment regarding the negro form of slavery. Perhaps not, but the sale of human flesh in any form and under any pretext is repugnant to the spirit and practice of English law, and can logically be put down under its provisions. Dr. Eitel tells us that to prohibit Chinese domestic servitude, in so far, would "constitute an act of violence, as striking at the very roots of the social organism, the results of which would, in all probability, be harmful to the Chinese and embarrassing to the Government." Few evils would be rectified if Governments shirked their duty to avoid trouble and embarrassment. Temporary distress and annoyance have often to be endured to ensure ultimate benefit, and it is absurd to suppose that any social reform can be effected without some disturbance of vested interests and existing institutions.

The report made by Dr. Eitel on the so-called domestic slavery or servitude question is an elaborate and able essay, displaying great knowledge of the subject and doing much credit to the argumentative capacity of the writer. The conclusions arrived at, however, are not so logical as might have been expected from a clear-headed reasoner, and the whole author somewhat too strongly of special pleading. The propositions with which the learned Doctor sum up seem to us to amount simply to this—that Chinese domestic servitude being an essentially Chinese custom among a Chinese community cannot be brought under English law; ergo, English law must give way in an English Colony to Chinese custom. An Englishman would not agree thus. We do not seek to impose our laws upon China; but all persons who come here are expected, without distinction of race, to conform to English law. Because a large proportion of the population of this Colony happens to be Chinese it does not follow that they are to be allowed to perpetuate practices here which, however sanctioned by the custom of their own country, are opposed to the fundamental principles of the British constitution. Dr. Eitel says that Chinese domestic servitude cannot logically be brought under the provisions of any English enactment regarding the negro form of slavery. Perhaps not, but the sale of human flesh in any form and under any pretext is repugnant to the spirit and practice of English law, and can logically be put down under its provisions. Dr. Eitel tells us that to prohibit Chinese domestic servitude, in so far, would "constitute an act of violence, as striking at the very roots of the social organism, the results of which would, in all probability, be harmful to the Chinese and embarrassing to the Government." Few evils would be rectified if Governments shirked their duty to avoid trouble and embarrassment. Temporary distress and annoyance have often to be endured to ensure ultimate benefit, and it is absurd to suppose that any social reform can be effected without some disturbance of vested interests and existing institutions.

The report made by Dr. Eitel on the so-called domestic slavery or servitude question is an elaborate and able essay, displaying great knowledge of the subject and doing much credit to the argumentative capacity of the writer. The conclusions arrived at, however, are not so logical as might have been expected from a clear-headed reasoner, and the whole author somewhat too strongly of special pleading. The propositions with which the learned Doctor sum up seem to us to amount simply to this—that Chinese domestic servitude being an essentially Chinese custom among a Chinese community cannot be brought under English law; ergo, English law must give way in an English Colony to Chinese custom. An Englishman would not agree thus. We do not seek to impose our laws upon China; but all persons who come here are expected, without distinction of race, to conform to English law. Because a large proportion of the population of this Colony happens to be Chinese it does not follow that they are to be allowed to perpetuate practices here which, however sanctioned by the custom of their own country, are opposed to the fundamental principles of the British constitution. Dr. Eitel says that Chinese domestic servitude cannot logically be brought under the provisions of any English enactment regarding the negro form of slavery. Perhaps not, but the sale of human flesh in any form and under any pretext is repugnant to the spirit and practice of English law, and can logically be put down under its provisions. Dr. Eitel tells us that to prohibit Chinese domestic servitude, in so far, would "constitute an act of violence, as striking at the very roots of the social organism, the results of which would, in all probability, be harmful to the Chinese and embarrassing to the Government." Few evils would be rectified if Governments shirked their duty to avoid trouble and embarrassment. Temporary distress and annoyance have often to be endured to ensure ultimate benefit, and it is absurd to suppose that any social reform can be effected without some disturbance of vested interests and existing institutions.

The report made by Dr. Eitel on the so-called domestic slavery or servitude question is an elaborate and able essay, displaying great knowledge of the subject and doing

time the family sacrifices, any one whose first wife proves childless will consider it his religious duty either to adopt a son to take a second or third wife, or to himself he may marry a son. To die without a son would be regarded as a sin. To die without a son would be regarded as a sin against one's ancestors. But in a family consisting of several wives there is no room for the sort of servant girl to which Western nations are accustomed. As servants are forbidden to all families below the rank of a prince, the custom of purchasing young girls for the performance of the lighter domestic duties became the general practice of all well-to-do families and their slaves. Such a girl should be particularly their parents for a certain time or sold for good. When only pledged, the case is generally this. A family being in urgent distress and requiring immediately a certain sum of money, take one of their female children, say five years old, who has been sufficiently impressed with the misery at home, to a wealthy family, who have a daughter of the same age, and has perhaps to look after the child. The father receives a small sum on the security of this child, and when that loan is repaid with interest, the child returns to her father's family to remain there till in the ordinary course she is sold as a betrothed wife, or as we call it, married. But the child may be sold out and out. In that case invariably a deal is drawn up called by a country life which covers a country people by four or five hundred people, and little hindrance is given, and the child becomes the slave of the servant of the family and is as entirely under the power of the head of that family, as if she were a slave, with the exception that an all-powerful custom required the master to find a husband for his servant girl when she is of age, and the moment she is married she is as free for ever as any married woman can be from domestic servitude, an excellent counter ready for the foreigner who wishes to buy a Chinese slave, and is the chief cause of the chronic outbreaks of famine, insurrections, and rebellions in an overpopulated country. But the abuse to which this system of buying and selling female slaves is liable in the hands of unscrupulous parents and buyers, and the support it leads to public prostitution are too patent to require pointing out.

The custom of domestic servitude is very common in India among all castes. In China, less common among the Pekinese people and comparatively rare among the Hakkas. This reason is that early betrothals and early marriages are common among both the Pekinese and especially among the Hakkas, who have, moreover, the custom of sending the betrothed, as soon as she is able to walk, say when three or four years old, to the family of her future husband, where she will remain until marriage, and has to do the same work and perform the same duties which the purchased servant girl is required to do in a Cantonese family. I must mention, however, by way of explanation, that polygamy is also comparatively rare among the Hakkas.

To foreigners of course it seems very unnatural that children should be sold into domestic servitude. But the Chinese sees nothing unnatural in it, and considers every social arrangement of China as natural. The Chinese, like the English, adoption, servitude, is principally based on a simple bargain. The root of this whole system of slavery and servitude is that while the Chinese people are instructed in the law of God, and constantly required to be purified by new modes of justification, Chinese slavery and Chinese domestic servitude never required any special pleading to justify it before the tribunal of natural law or moral sense. Indeed, the mere examination closely into Chinese slavery and servitude from the stand point of history and morality, and the results of the same, will have the exception of the system of manumission, all barbaric and revolting features, and are but the natural phenomena of a social organism which has its certain natural evolution, it will be seen that good and evil are mixed up in it.

Mr. Justice Francis—Is it not the law responsible for anything she had not in her possession or under her control to come under her control?

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a suit in Court, and if he did not believe so, he would file a suit in Court.

The Chief Justice—What is possession and control?

Mr. Hayler—She had taken possession and control of the whole thing.

The Chief Justice—Had Mr. Forbes possession and control?

Mr. Justice Francis—The daily accounts were brought to him and he was in the act of managing and controlling them.

Mr. Hayler said that if they believed Mr. Forbes had a right to the same, he would file a

